

CX Theory File

**(For Counterplans,
Permutations,
Kritiks, Miscellaneous)**

**Includes overviews and extensions for most common
arguments**

**The Forensics Files
The CX Files**

Table of Contents

Counterplans

Conditionality Bad.....	5-14
Conditionality Good	15-24
Dispositionality Bad	25-36
Dispositionality Good.....	37-40
PICs (Plan Inclusive Counterplans) Bad	41-42
PICs (Plan Inclusive Counterplans) Good	43-44
PECs (Plan Exclusive Counterplans) Good	45
Topical Counterplans Bad.....	46
Topical Counterplans Good	47
Neg Fiat Bad.....	48
Neg Fiat/ Counterplans Good	49
2NC Counterplans Bad.....	50
2NC Counterplans Good	51
International Fiat Bad	52
International Fiat Good.....	53-55
Multiple-Actor Fiat Bad	56
Multiple-Actor Fiat Good.....	57
Plan-Plus Counterplans Bad.....	58
Plan-Plus Counterplans Good	59
Process/ Normal Means Counterplans Bad	60
Process/ Normal Means Counterplans Good.....	61
Consult Counterplans Bad	62
Consult Counterplans Good	63
Agent Counterplans Bad.....	64

Agent Counterplans Good	65
Delay Counterplans Bad	66
Delay Counterplans Good.....	67
Counterplan Solvency Advocate Necessary.....	68
Counterplan Solvency Advocate <i>Not</i> Necessary	69
Textual Competition Bad (functional good)	70
Textual Competition Good (functional bad)	71

Permutations

Severance Permutations Bad.....	72
Severance Permutations Good	73
Intrinsic Permutations Bad	74
Intrinsic Permutations Good.....	75
Timeframe Permutations Bad.....	76
Timeframe Permutations Good	77
Multiple Permutations Bad	78
Multiple Permutations Good.....	79

Kritiks

Aff Framework vs. Kritiks	80-81
Neg Kritik Framework	82-84
Floating PICS Good	85
Alternative Text Necessary	86
Alternative Text <i>Not</i> Necessary.....	87

Miscellaneous

Covert Plans Bad	88
Future Fiat Bad	89
Performative Contradictions Bad	90
Performative Contradictions Good	91
Framework vs. Critical Affirmatives	92

Conditionality Bad

2AC

Conditionality is bad and a voter for competitive equity:

1. Even if we straight turn their counterplan they can drop it without penalty, which makes it distinctly unlike any other argument.
2. Skews 2AC strategy and the 1AR- the 2AC is not able to make consistent offensive arguments against multiple worlds and the 1AR doesn't have enough time to answer both. We're already behind after the neg block, making time allocation impossible in a debate with a conditional counterplan.
3. Conditionality hurts fairness - the aff must defend the plan through the entire round- allowing the neg to discard its policy options is unfair for the aff and causes argumentative irresponsibility.
4. Justifies contradictions- conditionality allows us the make arguments that screw us on other flows like running an economy disad and capitalism bad.
5. No unique right to a conditional counterplan- running the net benefit alone would allow the neg plenty of flex without killing aff ground.
6. Conditionality would allow the neg to run more than one counterplan, which would wipe out 2AC time allotment, because:
 - a. They could just run many counterplan texts.
 - b. The 2AC doesn't get extension time in an affirmative block.
 - c. Forces multiple worldviews.
7. It justifies severance perms- we need to have the same amount of strategic flexibility that they have with their counterplan.
8. Its worse that us being non-topical- because at least we would stick with our advocacy if they researched it and clashed with it, but by avoiding argumentative responsibility, they can just walk away from the counterplan at any time.
9. Uniqueness skew- if we read uniqueness for our turns to the net benefits, they have the counterplan suck it up. If we don't read uniqueness, they'll kick the counterplan and say they control uniqueness. Puts the aff in a double bind.
10. Dispositionality solves all your offense- if we at least had some way of sticking them with the counterplan, that would avoid all our abuse arguments.

Conditionality Bad

1AR OVERVIEW

Extend conditionality bad- it's a voting issue because they can run multiple contradicting arguments which destroys our strategy and puts us in a uniqueness double bind. Dispositionality solves all their offense because we could at least stick them to one world if we had the option. Evaluate theory like topicality- two competing interpretations of the way debates should go down. Our interpretation is that negatives should be able to run one dispositional counterplan. We'll win that our interpretation leads to more in-depth education debate which trumps any bad critical thinking skills arguments they will make. They don't have any good offensive reasons why conditionality is good, but we'll win that allowing them to kick the counterplan destroys 2AC strategy because the affirmative has to frame every argument against both the possibility of the status quo and the counterplan. If we win any offensive reason why conditionality is bad then the only option is to vote against them, allowing them to kick the counterplan only exacerbates the abuse. Their interpretation justifies multiple conditional advocacies even if they don't kick the counterplan or make contradictory arguments in this round. When you vote against them your not voting against what they did but what line of argumentation their interpretation justifies. The abuse has already happened with the skewed 2AC time allocation in multiple worlds, which has permanently shaped the rest of the debate.

Conditionality Bad

Conditional PICs 1AR

Our interpretation is that the neg can run a PIC or a conditional counterplan, but not both. If we read offense that links harder to the PIC then they can kick it and go for it as offense against us. That's a voter because we can't make offense, which is the only unique advantage of the aff. In addition, extend our first sub point on conditionality- we lose 2AC offense from add-ons, 2AC offense on disads and 1AC offense because the PIC solves it.

Conditionality Bad

Answers to: Permutations Check Abuse-

1. Permutations don't increase aff ground and its not reciprocal- we always have to defend all of the affirmative plan, but they get to kick the counterplan at will.
2. No possible perms we could have made- mutually exclusive counterplan means every perm is either intrinsic or severance or links to a net-benefit.
3. Not responsive to strategy skew- permutations cannot check if they run multiple contradictory arguments. They could concede permutations to get links on other positions.
4. Not a reciprocal time trade off- more 2AC time is spent on the counterplan than on the permutation.

Conditionality Bad

Answers to: All arguments are conditional-

1. Not true- every argument outside of topicality is dispositional.
2. Counterplans are unique- they change how every argument in the debate interrelates to each other.
3. Not responsive to the strategy skew, only the time skew- counterplans allow for contradictory arguments which leads to 1AR strategy skew.
4. Strategic concessions on other arguments check that abuse- running contradictory disads allows the aff to concede link arguments to get turns.

Conditionality Bad

Answers to: Consistent strategy in the 2NR

1. Doesn't answer 2AC/1AR time skew- by the 2NR the debate is already over.
2. Consistency in the 2NR hurts affirmative ground- it means the 2NR has 5 minutes of offense defending the status quo versus 2.5 minutes of the 1AR.

Conditionality Bad

Answers to: “Forces 2AC decision making/ Critical thinking”-

1. Not responsive to the 1AR strategy skew- the 1AR doesn't have enough time to win straight turns on a counterplan.
2. 2AC decision making is bad- it forces the 2AC to debate in multiple worlds destroying in-depth coverage and education.
3. When the aff loses every debate, people will leave the activity, preventing any critical thinking whatsoever.
4. Strategic thinking is non-unique- Different non-counterplan arguments can force us to think and make strategic choices.
5. Fairness trumps strategic thinking because it's key to education. There's no value to coming to an end round conclusion if the calculus was skewed to one side.

Conditionality Bad

Answers to: "Most Real World"-

1. Debates not real world- speech times, a judge, and topicality arguments justifies a unique paradigm for looking at debates. The judge isn't a member of congress.
2. 1AR strategy skew comes before real world concerns- means we could have debated real world implications better.
3. We'll win that a consistent advocacy is better for education and more predictable than real world policies.

Conditionality Bad

Answers to: “Best Policy Option”-

1. Search for best policy option justifies a non-topical affirmative that stops nuclear war-
 - a. The negative could never win a debate
 - b. Justifies outweighing jurisdictional arguments with plan advantages
2. Strategy skew predisposes the search for the best policy option- 2AC/1AR
strategy skew means that conditional counterplan affected our ability to debate all of the arguments.

Conditionality Bad

Answers to: “Key to Neg Flexibility”-

1. Too much flexibility is bad- they're being abusive and justifying all kinds of abuse.
2. The neg wins most rounds anyway- they knew what we were running before the round, we didn't know what they were running.
3. Decreases education- we'll never learn about their arguments because they're being used as a tool to jack the aff.

Conditionality Good

1. Strategic thinking- Making the affirmative think about multiple worlds and the way they interconnect while making smart, efficient arguments forces strategic thinking that is crucial for argumentative education.
2. Best policy option- Conditionality lets us fully test the Aff in order to determine the best solution. This is key to policy education.
3. It's reciprocal- All arguments are conditional. They can kick advantages, 2AC arguments, and their perm. Even without conditional counterplans, the Neg has many options the aff can't straight turn to stick us with, including solvency turns, case defense, and topicality.
4. Education trumps fairness- A fair round devoid of critical thinking is not a good round.
5. Time skew is inevitable- you skew your own time, otherwise you'd always vote for the slowest team.
6. Key to negative flexibility- being able to test the plan at multiple levels is essential to neg strategy and ground which outweighs any aff ground loss.
7. Don't vote on potential abuse- they have to prove our specific conditional counterplan is abusive. We also aren't contradicting ourselves.
8. It's most real world- policy making always tests a plan against multiple ideas, even if they contradict.
9. Err neg on theory- they have aff choice, speak first and last, have infinite prep time, and win most of the rounds.
10. At most you should reject the argument, not the team.
11. The perm justifies conditionality-
 - a. If the perm is conditional then they lose too.
 - b. If the perm is not then they must advocate that in the 2AR.

Conditionality Good

Overview

This is a really messy debate so I'll clean it up a little: We'll win that the most important impact here is education, because it's the reason debate was created, and is the value we take from debate at the end of the day.

Fairness may be one way to get to education, but that debate is going to be really muddled because we'll always be able to win some risk of defense—there's a chance conditionality is fair because it's reciprocal, since both teams can drop arguments, because it doesn't generate any abuse that isn't inevitable outside of conditionality, and because the affirmative should be ready to defend themselves from multiple angles already. The Aff, on the other hand, has no defense against the educational benefits garnered from strategic thinking.

At that point, strategic thinking is going to be the clearest internal link to education and the best way to resolve this debate. Conditionality generates strategic thinking by forcing us to think about multiple worlds, their interconnections, and their real implications for policy. This is uniquely good education.

Conditionality Good

Answers To: Strategy Skew-

1. Good. Their notion of “un-skewed strategy” translates to reading blocks without ever having to think about what they’re saying. This guts the activity of educational value. What they call strategy skew we call strategic thinking. Making them think about multiple worlds and the way they interconnect is crucial for argumentative education.

Conditionality Good

Answers To: Time Skew-

1. Time-skew is inevitable. We could've run 10 disads and skewed their time.
2. It creates the best decision making by forcing them to pick just their best arguments.

Conditionality Good

Answers To: Argumentative Responsibility-

1. We'll always be held to some degree of responsibility because we need a cohesive view in the 2NR.
2. There's no impact. They have no warrant for why irresponsibility should mean rejection.
3. They have no definition of what constitutes responsibly dealing with an argument. The only thing they characterize as irresponsible is dropping something, but if this is irresponsible make them go for every single argument they make.

Conditionality Good

Answers To: Moving Target-

1. We're not a moving target—there's only two things we could go for at the end of this round: the CP or the status quo.
2. Making the affirmative defend themselves from more than one angle is a good thing because it creates strategic thinking—making them think harder and increasing education by making them think about multiple worlds and their interconnections.

Conditionality Good

Answers To: Hurts Depth-

1. Turn- We create the best kind of depth. Starting with a breadth of options and narrowing to a single cohesive view is the best way to make decisions.
2. Their theory arguments are a destructive use of depth, making them infinitely worse than our single conditional alternative and case arguments which are a productive use of breadth.

Conditionality Good

Answers To: “Strategy trades off with truth”-

1. Strategy is inevitable; everything is done for strategic advantage.
2. You can't separate the best strategy from the best argument because the best argument will always be the most strategic.

Conditionality Good

Answers To: "Gives Neg Strategic Advantage/ Unfair"-

1. One team having an advantage does not mean it's not fair. It's entirely inevitable since everything is done for strategic advantage.
2. Without conditionality, the affirmative would have just as much of an advantage since limiting us to a single policy option only benefits them. This is worse for debate because the Aff already has side bias from getting to pick their case, giving the first and last speech, and having infinite prep.

Conditionality Good

Answers To: “Dispo Checks Offense”-

1. Dispositionality is fake. We could have run our counterplan conditional based on arguments and let them stick us with the counterplan if they put no answers on it. This would give the aff the choice of whether we go for the counterplan, proves the deficiency of their logic.
2. Conditionality is the method that best tests policy and engenders the most strategic thinking.

Dispositionality Bad

2AC

Dispositional counterplans are bad and a voter for competitive equity-

1. 2AC strategy skew- offense is key to checking the block but we have to be able to perm the counterplan to get out of artificial net benefits.
2. Dispositionality is fake- They could run a counterplan conditionally; based on arguments and kick it only if we put answers on it. This would give the aff the choice of whether we go for the counterplan, proves the deficiency of their logic.
3. Multiple worlds- The neg can run multiple contradicting alternatives that we have to defend against, which destroys in-depth policy analysis and negative advocacy.
4. Uniqueness skew- if we read uniqueness for our turns to the net benefits, they have the counterplan suck it up. If we don't read uniqueness, they'll kick the counterplan and say they control uniqueness. Puts the aff in a double bind.
5. They are still a moving target since they can walk away from the counterplan if we don't turn it. No matter what the debate is a guessing game until the 2NR. This skews 2AC time allocation and means that their advocacy is constantly shifting.
6. They destroy aff ground- both theory and permutations are our best levels of offense.
7. Dispositionality forces us to concede one aspect of the counterplan; if we did both they could still kick it.
8. Bad for education- discussions of competitiveness is critical to education, dispo closes off space to educational arguments.
9. It's really just conditionality- the aff is severely disadvantaged; if they straight turn the counterplan the negative has 13 minutes to answer the turns.

Dispositionality Bad

1AR Overview

Extend our dispo bad arguments. It's a voting issue because they can run multiple contradicting arguments which destroys our strategy and puts us in a uniqueness double bind. Also, we have to make a perm to get out of artificial net benefits, like a save one dollar counterplan. This means that the counterplan is conditional.

Extend that it's a voter for fairness-

- a. Forcing us to only straight turn the counterplan for them to stick with it is arbitrary. They could say they would go for the CP if we danced on the table. It only gives us the illusion of choice.
- b. Its just conditionality in disguise-
 - i. Justifies utopian fiat- there's no way we could straight turn something like world peace, we'd have to make a theoretical objection to it, allowing them to create multiple worlds.
 - ii. Destroys research burden- they could think of a random counterplan that no one would have evidence to and the only offense the aff could have would be theory.
 - iii. Proves it's a time suck- it creates multiple worlds in which we have to debate in during the 2AC and 1AR.

Also extend that they destroy aff ground because both theory and policy are levels of offense. Dispositionality forces us to concede one aspect of the counterplan; if we did both they could still kick it.

They will still be a moving target until the 2NR, which has completely jacked our 2AC and 1AR strategy, permanently shaping the rest of the debate.

The above is a voter for education and competitive equity.

Dispositionality Bad

1AR Overview on Dispositional PICs-

Our interpretation is that the negative can run a PIC or a dispositional counterplan, but not both. If we read offense that links harder to the PIC they can kick it and go for it as offense against us. That's a voter because we can't make offense, which is the only unique advantage for the aff. Next, extend our 2AC argument that we have to make a perm to get out of artificial net benefits, like a save one dollar counterplan. This means that the counterplan is conditional. Conditionality is a voter for fairness because it kills 1AC ground and leads to multiple worlds.

Dispositionality Bad

Answer To: “No Time Skew- We’d Read Other Arguments Instead”-

1. Not true- Counterplans are advocacies that try to solve the case, which destroys our ability to leverage our case against disads and kritiks, proves counterplans are unique.
2. Those other arguments do not create whole new worlds that we must answer. If those worlds dissappear, all of our arguments made on that flow do as well, proving the time and strategy skew that occurred in the 2AC and permanently defined the rest of the debate.

Dispositionality Bad

Answers To: “Advocacies Are Bad”-

1. Justifies us making a new perm in the 2AR as our policy option because it's most real world.
2. Puts the aff at a disadvantage because we are forced to advocate something the neg is not.
3. Inconsistent advocacies are worse- forces the aff to contradict ourselves. Debate is about opposing each other's ideas, not changing them in the middle of the round.
4. Advocacies shape us to be political actors in changing real world situations for the better.
5. Consistent advocacies are best- proves there's nothing wrong with our original advocacy. We didn't have to change anything, they did, which means they should lose.

Dispositionality Bad

Answers To: "Permutations Check"-

1. Perms don't check- They just check the competitiveness of the counterplan. It's not an extra world.
2. We still lose offense- We don't get our uniqueness back, proves there's still abuse.
3. Puts us in a double-bind- Either we perm the counterplan and they can kick it, functionally making the counterplan conditional, or we don't perm, which guarantees the counterplan gets non-germane advantages. Destroys aff strategy.
4. If we made a perm, they could kick the counterplan. That's not checking abuse, that's proving it.
5. Double bind- either
 - a. Perms aren't worlds and you still link, or
 - b. Perms are fiat and we can choose ones plus plan as policy options in the 2AR.
6. Not true- they made theoretical objections to our permutations instead of straight turning them, which disproves dispositionality.

Dispositionality Bad

Answers To: “Aff Side Bias Checks Abuse”-

1. You have no evidence supporting your claim that affs win more.
2. They have 13 minutes of the block to check this back and they knew what we were running before the round.
3. These aren't reasons to be abusive.
4. The resolution makes neg research easy.
5. The neg also has infinite prep to prepare negative arguments and arguments against aff responses.
6. Err aff on theory- We have the hardest speeches to give.

Dispositionality Bad

Answers to: “Key to Neg Flexibility”-

1. Too much flexibility is bad- they're being abusive and justifying all kinds of abuse.
2. The neg wins most rounds anyway- they knew what we were running before the round, we didn't know what they were running.
3. Decreases education- we'll never learn about their arguments because they're being used as a tool to jack the aff.

Dispositionality Bad

Answers To: "8 Minutes of 1AC Offense Checks"-

1. We still lost strategy- We can't develop the 1AC offense in the 2AC or 1AR, which means we could never win that they case outweighs the disads.
2. We still lost uniqueness debates, which inevitably means we lose the direction of the link.
3. This proves our multiple worlds argument- We spend the entire debate on the counterplan, then at their convenience they revert back to the status quo. This destroys competitive equity.

Dispositionality Bad

Answers To: “Dispo key to Ground”-

1. It's not key to ground- you could read the net benefits and make the same argument.
2. Not true- you could advocate the counterplan, solves your offense.
3. Dispo opens the door to multiple contradictory counterplans- this destroys aff ground and destroys predictability.

Dispositionality Bad

Answers To: “Dispo Key to Education”-

1. 2AC strategy skew turns the link- You can't have an educational debate if the 2AC is skewed out of the debate by answering contradictory arguments.
2. Argumentative responsibility solves- It forces in-depth research on the core areas of the resolution and doesn't cause 2AC strat skew.

Dispositionality Bad

Answers to: “Forces 2AC decision making/ Critical thinking”-

6. Not responsive to the 1AR strategy skew- the 1AR doesn't have enough time to win straight turns on a counterplan.
7. 2AC decision making is bad- it forces the 2AC to debate in multiple worlds destroying in-depth coverage and education.
8. When the aff loses every debate, people will leave the activity, preventing any critical thinking whatsoever.
9. Strategic thinking is non-unique- Different non-counterplan arguments can force us to think and make strategic choices.
10. Fairness trumps strategic thinking because it's key to education. There's no value to coming to an end round conclusion if the calculus was skewed to one side.

Dispositionality Good

1. Time skew inevitable- you skew your own time, otherwise you would always vote for the slowest team.
2. Improves critical thinking- the neg initiates a multidimensional debate, making strategies more interesting and forcing them to make smart, efficient arguments.
3. Key to neg flexibility- being able to test the plan at multiple levels is essential to negative strategy and ground which outweighs any aff ground loss.
4. Our interpretation is that the neg gets one dispositional alternative to the status quo. This solves their multiple worlds arguments and ensures competitive equity. Its our only check on crazy affs.
5. Aff choice solves for all of their offense that would apply to a conditional counterplan. They can choose to force our option and straight turn the counterplan.
6. Best policy option- it improves policy focus because it helps test and develop the most effective policy. We must have the ability to make an informed 2NR decision between the counterplan and status quo.
7. Its reciprocal- conditionality is key to checking multiple conditional perms. The aff's unlimited number of conditional perms skews neg strat and time allocation.
8. Its like a disad- its no different from kicking any other neg argument, no abuse or time skew.
9. Make them prove why our specific counterplan has abused them. We are only running one and they should be ready for it.
10. All counterplans are dispositional- the advent of perms as tests of competition always leaves the status quo as an option. Counterplan ground is critical to the neg strat, competitive equity, and the educational value of debate.
11. Err neg on theory- they get the first and last speech, infinite prep time, and have the highest winning percentage.
12. Permutations check abuse and ensure reciprocity- the neg has 2 worlds- counterplan and status quo- and the aff gets the plan and perm.
13. At most you should reject the argument, not the team.

Dispositionality Good

2NR Overview

This is a really messy debate so I'll clean it up a little: We'll win that the most important impact here is education, because it's the reason debate was created, and the value we take from debate at the end of the day.

Fairness may be one way to get to education, but that debate is going to be really muddled because we'll always be able to win some risk of defense—dispositionality is fair because they get to choose to stick us with it or not in the 2AC and it's reciprocal, since both teams can drop arguments, because it doesn't generate any abuse that isn't inevitable outside of dispositionality, and because the affirmative should be ready to defend themselves from multiple angles already. The Aff, on the other hand, has no defense against the educational benefits garnered from strategic thinking.

At that point, strategic thinking is going to be the clearest internal link to education and the best way to resolve this debate. Dispositionality generates strategic thinking by forcing us to think about multiple worlds, their interconnections, and their real implications for policy. This is uniquely good education.

Remember, infinite prep, perms, 2NR collapse, and side bias all check back any abuse scenario they could come up with in their next speech.

Our interpretation from the last speech as well as the fact that the aff controls the debate in the 2AC solve for all of their offensive reasons to vote against us on theory.

Dispositionality Good

Answers to: Time Pressures-

1. No time trade-off:
 - a. I'll spend more time defending the counterplan than you do answering it.
 - b. If there wasn't a counterplan, we'd just read other arguments, proves there is no skew.
2. Not a voter
 - a. Justifies affirmative action for slow teams and punishes teams for doing speed drills.
 - b. Non-unique- some people are faster than others, some people read shorter shells than others, etc...
 - c. No threshold- they can't explain when a time skew becomes so bad that it's a voting issue.

Dispositionality Good

Answers to: Strategy Skew-

1. Strategy skew is inevitable-
 - a. Different teams produce different amounts of evidence, one team will inevitably have more cards than another.
 - b. 2NR collapse makes this non-unique- You're never sure what's really going to happen until the 2NR, regardless of dispositionality.
2. Not a voter-
 - a. There's no right to a specific 2AC strategy- as long as ground is defensible, its good ground.
 - b. Counterplans aren't distinct- world views are implied in topicality, disads, and kritiks.

PICs (Plan Inclusive Counterplans) Bad

2AC

1. Encourages vague plan writing- the aff responds by not specifying anything in the plan text- undermining advocacy and negative debatability.
2. Kills aff ground- by preventing us from using our plan as offense since they stole all the non-topical and topical ground except on one small issue. This crushes any fairness in the round.
3. Strategy skew- we can't make consistent impact calculus with the 1AC or read 2AC add-ons.
4. Justifies severance perms- we need to be able to perm the "save one dollar" counterplan.
5. Infinitely regressive- they will always find something smaller to exclude from the plan. We'll be debating comma placement, handwriting, funding sources, and intent.
6. Creates a time skew- the aff loses 8 minutes of speech time with the neg disregarding the topical concerns. Independent voter for fairness.
7. Destroys clash- by forcing vague plan writing and skimming the debate down to minor issues.
8. They must have specific solvency evidence- otherwise its not reciprocal or predictable since its not in the literature.
9. Trivializes the topic away from the merits of the plan- the resolution doesn't specify implementation for a reason. We'll be debating the most obscure sections of the plan, which promotes trivial research and kills education.
10. They're topical- stealing the aff's right to defend the resolution.
11. Justifies intrinsic perms- we need them in order to eliminate the disads not intrinsic to the aff and to restore lost ground by adding planks we lost to the counterplan.
12. Voting issue- for Fairness, Ground, Education, and Predictability.

PICs (Plan Inclusive Counterplans) Bad

1AR Overview

You can vote right now on theory. They haven't adequately answered multiple offensive reasons why them running a plan-inclusive counterplan has negatively impacted the entire debate round from the start. We have not been able to read any offense or add-on advantages because they were all sucked up by the counterplan, since they are stealing off ground by doing almost our entire plan except for one tiny thing. It's simply impossible for us to predict and research everything that the negative could subtract from our plan. If they don't have a specific solvency advocate, then that's only proof that their counterplan isn't in the literature and therefore impossible for us to be prepared to answer. Also, if we win any risk of abuse on this PICs debate, then you have to grant us any severance and intrinsic permutations, since that's the only way we can answer these counterplans, like "we'll do your plan and spend 5 dollars less". They are allowed to run any counterplans that aren't PICs. Remember, we can't get back our lost 2AC time or argument allocation. Even if you don't buy our abuse arguments, you should still vote against them for damaging fairness, ground, and education.

PICs (Plan Inclusive Counterplans) Good

1. They are destroying all counterplan ground- since all counterplans have to be PICs to compete. Counterplan ground is key to neg ground and finding the best policy option.
2. More real world- policy makers always change plans and ideas.
3. Counter-interpretation- the neg can run one PIC if it is not germane (AND/OR has a solvency advocate).
4. Its predictable- PICs are derived from the plan. They chose to write their plan like they did, they should be prepared to defend all of it.
5. Increases education- by debating each facet of the affirmative plan, we promote in-depth debate on the focus of the round; the aff plan.
6. Permutations check any abuse they can claim.
7. PICs are key to neg flex and strategy- PICs prevent the neg from having to defend an unacceptable status quo.
8. Net Benefit and literature check any abuse and infinite regression- the aff can read turns to the net benefit.
9. Err neg on theory- they have aff choice, speak first and last, have infinite prep time, and win the most rounds.
10. Competition disproves any nontrivial argument. Our net benefit authors obviously think that the difference between the plan and counterplan is very significant, or else there wouldn't be a reason to reject the plan.
11. The history of debate and the existence of procedural arguments prevent their plan vagueness arguments from coming true. And PICs encourage the best plan writing by forcing teams to ensure that they can defend everything they include. Affirmatives know that if they write their plans too vague they will get Piced out of.
12. At most you should reject the argument, not the team, but only if they show that we have uniquely abused them.

PICs (Plan Inclusive Counterplans) Good

Overview

Excluding our counterplan for being a PIC would essentially destroy all counterplans since all could be considered PICs for including the same actor, using the same funding, or addressing the same harms. Eliminating counterplans would totally destroy debate because we would lose all of the important education about how to best construct a policy, since the Aff would only ever measure their plan against the status quo and never think about different ways to draft it. This education should be evaluated before the fairness they talk about. Fairness may be one way to get to education, but that debate will be really muddled because we'll always win some risk of defense. They only have to answer the part the net benefit stems from and they should be prepared to defend everything they include in their plan. At this point, PICs prove to provide the clearest internal link to education and the best way to resolve this debate.

PECs (Plan Exclusive Counterplans) Good

1. They are destroying all counterplan ground- if we can't leave parts of your plan out in the counterplan, our only other option is to be plan-plus and not competitive.
2. There are multiple checks on abuse-
 - a. Affirmative choice- if you can't defend it, don't put it in your plan.
 - b. We have to find a net benefit, so the literature limits our options and makes it predictable.
3. Necessary to test the plan- the aff must be prepared to defend all planks.
4. Most real world- if a bill is passed which is basically good, then policymakers can eliminate the bad parts of the plan and vote it into effect.
5. Most educational- we debate the specifics of the plan and its particular ramifications, which allows for the most in-depth education.
6. Exclusionary counterplans are especially legitimate on topics where you have country selection choice- because you have the option of choosing which countries to include in the plan, you should be prepared for it. Exclusionary counterplans are the necessary check.
7. Predictability checks aff research burdens- surely they knew they would have to defend their agent and means of implementation.
8. Err neg on theory- they have aff choice, speak first and last, have infinite prep time, and win most of the rounds.
9. At most you should reject the argument, not the team.

Topical Counterplans Bad

1. Kills aff ground- they intrude upon the resolution which is defined affirmative ground, ruining the division of ground.
2. Explodes research burden- we have to research against other aff's to debate aff as well as both topical and non-topical counterplans.
3. Kills the resolution-
 - a. They are not de-justifying the resolution; because they're topical—vote aff.
 - b. Not reciprocal- the resolution is designed to give both aff and neg equal ground- they're trampling our ground- that justifies non-topical plans for reciprocity.
4. Justifies plan-plan debates which moot the 1AC and de-justify any neg research, killing the educational value of switch-side debate.
5. They steal permutation ground- we can't find authors who support both proposals.

Topical Counterplans Good

1. Competition checks any abuse from ludicrous counterplans we might run.
2. Best for education- since often the best alternatives are the ones that are topical; ignoring this whole ground of counterplans hurts overall debate.
3. Counter-interpretation: only topical counterplans are legitimate:
 - a. The plan becomes the focus of the debate- aff gets infinite prep to choose their plan- now they have to defend it.
 - b. Resolutional focus is bad- it justifies counter warrants and alternate justification, destroying clash.
 - c. Increases topical education- topical counterplans allow us to focus on and discuss the resolution on a more in-depth basis.
4. They can always just debate the net-benefit, we can't win without one.
5. Topical counterplans aid the search for the best policy option, which is the goal of your ballot.
6. Don't vote without real, in round abuse. At most reject the argument, not the team.
7. Most real world- legislators wouldn't reject an alternative policy just because it is similar to another.
8. Err neg- they get the first and last speech and infinite prep time.
9. We increase clash-
 - a. By increasing predictability- we narrow down the number of counterplans the negative has to choose from. They should have already come across this counterplan in the literature and been ready for it.
 - b. By decreasing the research burden- their research is now confined to the resolution.

Neg Fiat Bad

Negative fiat is bad and a voter for fairness:

1. Fiat derives from the word “should”- there is no implied “should not.” Words are carefully placed in the resolution for a reason.
2. Reciprocity doesn’t check, because:
 - a. We can’t run disads in the 1AC
 - b. Aff fiat is limited because it is confined by the resolution. The neg would always claim unlimited fiat.
 - c. They have presumption and the negative block to work with.
3. Kills aff research burden- the neg ability to fiat explodes aff research burden because there are infinite amounts of topical and non-topical counterplans.
4. Skews 2AC strategy- negative fiat exponentially increases the number of worlds the aff has to answer- the 1AC is crafted to answer the status quo.

Neg Fiat/ Counterplans Good

1. Key to neg flex- the neg has to have other option than an undesirable status quo. "Racism good" is bad ground.
2. Reciprocity-the aff gets one plan and the neg should get one plan. As long as the neg plan competes with the aff plan it still forces choice.
3. The plan is the focus of the debate- we should be seeking the best policy option and the way to do this is by presenting different competing policy options.
4. There is an implied "should not" in the resolution- the aff gets their fiat from the world "should", so we get ours from the "should not".
5. The aff gets to speak first and last, wins more debates, and gets infinite prep time, so you should err neg on theory... especially this time.
6. Most real world- congress debates alternative proposals all the time- this allows us to pursue the best policy making and learn much more.
7. Turn- counterplans increase clash and specificity- otherwise the negative would run generic disads and vague links.
8. It forces the aff to defend their plan- the literature debates the best solutions which proves there is no ground loss because they can research and debate competing policies.
9. We won't abuse it- We don't propose to use unreasonable amounts of fiat. We aren't fiating a utopian counterplan, like anarchy.
10. Counterplans are now commonplace in debate, they should be ready for them.

2NC Counterplans Bad

They read a new counterplan in the block, that's abusive and a voter for education and competitive equity:

1. Serious strategy skew- the 2AC strategy was based on their 1NC strategy, now they've mooted much of it while still keeping their 1NC arguments.
2. Huge 1AR time skew- we're already under a crunch answering 13 minutes of arguments with 5. We can't be expected to adequately answer brand new advocacies.
3. Destroys education- both sides cannot develop arguments and learn in-depth, we just keep producing new arguments until the end, avoiding any real clash.
4. There's no way for the affirmative to predict new advocacies after our constructives, the new counterplan destroys debatability.
5. Destroys advocacy- allowing them to kick out of straight-turned disads make all of their arguments conditional, destroying clash.
6. Justifies new 1AR advocacies <insert some>.

2NC Counterplans Good

1. They still get a cross-examination period after the 2NC, that's why it's a constructive and fair for us to read new arguments.
2. Negation theory checks- it's our job to test the aff from every angle, 2NC counterplans are the best way to do that.
3. Critical thinking- the 1AR is now forced to make smarter, more efficient arguments, which is best for education.
4. No time skew- we have to spend our neg block to develop these arguments. They have to answer the whole neg block in the 1AR anyway.
5. Err neg on theory- they get to speak first and last, get infinite prep time, and win most debates.
6. Don't vote without specific, in round abuse. At worst you should reject the argument, not the team.

International Fiat Bad

International fiat is bad and a voter for fairness:

1. Doesn't test the agent- the disad proves that U.S. action is bad- the counterplan is extraneous.
2. Unfair research burden- we have to research every country to find potential counteragents.
3. Skews ground toward the negative- They get to pick between 160 countries, while we are limited to only the United States. The reciprocal nature of fiat is crushed.
4. Language barrier prevents adequate discussion- the most in-depth education literature on the counterplan isn't in English so, at best, the literature represents a biased view of the policy, written from the viewpoint of the West.
5. False judicial dichotomy- no actor faces deciding between one nation or another to do a policy. This sets up a false role for the judge and isn't competitive with the aff, destroying predictability.
6. No solvency advocate- They don't have any evidence saying specifically that their counterplan should be done. That's bad because it:
 - a. Isn't predictable- we could never research it because there's no literature on it.
 - b. Destroys ground- there could be no permutation aff literature on it.
7. Justifies severance and intrinsic perms because its just as predictable.

International Fiat Good

1. Literature checks abuse- as long as we find literature on international action, it should be legitimate. This prevents infinite regression because we are constrained to advocates and ensures fair aff ground because its debatable.
2. It's key to find the best policy option—if another country is better than the U.S. acting alone then the counterplan is justified because of truth—education outweighs fairness, otherwise the activity is hollow.
3. The starting points of policies have major implications on the outcomes of those policies. The resolution requires them to use the federal government as the beginning point of their advocacy, so they should be able to defend it.
4. Its key on this topic in order to better understand and examine international law. Proves they are significantly decreasing education.
5. Key to test the resolution—international fiat tests the fundamental necessity of the U.S. action mandated by the resolution. Without international counterplans, the Neg would always lose to random Affs with no U.S. key warrant. A world without international counterplans is worse for the negative than a world with them is for the affirmative.
6. Prevents ethnocentrism—inclusion of international fiat allows us to focus on the political affairs of other countries which promotes education about different cultures and political systems.
7. Not a voter- reject the argument, not the team.
8. Err neg- the aff gets the first and last speech, infinite prep time, and wins most debates.

International Fiat Good

2NR Overview

First, our counterplan is entirely fair—all they have to do to adequately answer it is defend the United States and answer the net benefit. These are not unreasonable burdens to expect of the affirmative; they are two really predictable parts of debate.

But fairness shouldn't be the issue. Education is the most important impact because it's the reason debate was created, and the value we take from debate at the end of the day. Fairness may be one way to get to education, but that debate is going to be really muddled because we'll always win some risk of our defense. The Aff, on the other hand, has no defense against the other ways our counterplan accesses education, making them the clearest internal links to education and where you should be evaluating this debate. Our counterplan produces the best education for two main reasons:

First, international counterplans are essential to understanding and evaluating international relations and interactions, which is uniquely key on this topic. The starting point of a policy—which the resolution mandates be the US—has major implications for its results, and how international law is dealt with plays an important role in the outcome of national law. Fully testing the resolution to create the best policy is uniquely good education.

Second, and most importantly, international fiat challenges the ethnocentrism enabling us to focus on the political affairs of other countries to promote education about different cultures and political systems.

International Fiat Good

Answers To: Infinite Regression/ Predictability-

1. It's reciprocal: They can solve in an infinite amount of countries we get the counterplan.
2. Literature checks any abuse. Without solvency evidence we would lose.
3. U.S. advantages check. As long as they have good US key warrants they won't lose.
4. All they have to do is answer the net-benefit. We can't win without one.

Multiple-Actor Fiat Bad

Multi-actor fiat is bad and an independent voter for Fairness, Ground, and Predictability:

1. No literature basis- No one advocates different actors doing different actions simultaneously. Its not real world and creates an impossible research burden.
2. Infinitely regressive- justifies fiat away wars and environmental destruction, crushing our advantage ground.
3. Its not reciprocal- allowing them to use multiple actors reduces our offense against the counterplan. For example, if they fiat China and Russia, they have destroyed our link to a China disad against Russian action.
4. Destroys decision calculus and imposes impossible time constraints- A judge should only ask what one actor should do at a time. No actor gets to decide their course of action while fiatng the action of other actors. And limited round time prevents the comparison of more than 2 actors.
5. Huge solvency deficit to the counterplan- They have to prove that joint actions works. The plan solves better than the counterplan each time they don't have a specific solvency advocate for the counterplan action and each case advantage.

Multiple-Actor Fiat Good

1. Key to neg stat and flex- multiple actors enable the neg to best test the aff.
2. All plans use or directly imply multi-agent fiat- whenever the federal government acts, its decisions are enforced at all levels of government.
3. They kill important counterplan ground- For example, we couldn't use the UN, EU, or African Union because they act through all of their member states.
4. The perm links more- they permuted the counterplan, which means they are complicit in multi-agent fiat more than we are.
5. Multi-actor fiat increases aff ground- the greater the number of actors, the more offense can be run- one or more of these actors could be bad and attacked on a solvency/disad level.
6. Education- we learn more about actors, increasing education.
7. Competition checks abuse- we're still going to have to win the net benefits to the counterplan.
8. Multi-actor counterplans best aid the search for the best policy option.
9. Not a voter- at most you would reject the argument, not the team.
10. Err neg on theory- they get the first and last speech, infinite prep time, and win the most debates.

Plan-Plus Counterplans Bad

1. Education- we lose all education about the plan because the counterplan is all of the plan plus something. The aff can never predict what crazy thing the neg is going to add on.
2. Fairness- Plan plus moots the 1AC and turns any research we did on advantages back on us. It also forces us to debate against our own solvency and kills add on advantages.
3. Dispositional/ Conditional plan plus counterplans are uniquely bad- they moot the 1AC if you go for them, but if you kick them then we are the only ones who have to defend the plan. This dissolves any offense against the plank they added, kills add-on advantages because the counterplan could have soaked them up, and allows the neg to claim solvency of our advantages or the turns on them, skewing our time.
4. Infinitely regressive- there is no reason that you couldn't do all of the plan and add solving for world hunger, or fiat politics, etc...
5. Not competitive- we can include all of plan and all of the counterplan with the perm "do the counterplan".
6. Voter for the reasons above, including education and competitive equity.

Plan-Plus Counterplans Good

1. Still competitive- you still cannot perm the counterplan because _____.
2. Their arguments just aren't true- even if the counterplan does all of the plan, it does it in a different way than the plan does. This means that it's a legitimate counterplan if we can prove that its competitive.
3. Ground- if the aff just gives monetary aid to Africa then the neg needs to be able to give different types of aid as well. The only competitive way to do that is to give many types of aid because the aff does not advocate the other types of aid that are left. This ground is key when the status quo is indefensible.
4. Education- plan plus lets us learn about additional things that should be included in the plan, forcing more case specific research and allowing the neg some predictable ground to research.
5. Tests the resolution- we should be able to add things to plan to see if they would increase the effectiveness of it. If so then we have proved that there is a better way to do the plan. The aff must prove that they can topically absorb what we add or the resolution is an opportunity cost.
6. Its predictable- they did the research and chose to write their plan like they did. They had to have come across our evidence in their research and they should have cut answers to it.
7. At most you should reject the argument, not the team.
8. Err neg on theory- they get the first and last speech, infinite prep time, and win the most rounds.

Process/ Normal Means Counterplans Bad

1. Infinitely regressive- the neg could reverse the Bush vs. Gore decision and have Gore do the plan with a global warming political capital net benefit. Its impossible to predict them and they soak up 100% of the 1AC, so we immediately lose 8 minutes of offense.
2. Normal means assumes the status quo- its not in our plan because it depends on the status quo. If the counterplan modifies the status quo and therefore normal means, we should be able to perm it.
3. Not textually competitive- textual competition is key to objectively measuring the competitiveness of the plan.
4. Not educational- we should be learning about how to craft the best policies to address the resolution, not figuring out what normal means is, which could be discussed every year with little educational benefit.
5. CX checks- they should have asked us what normal means meant. They didn't; which makes our permutation our clarification.

Process/ Normal Means Counterplans Good

1. Prevents vague plan writing- the aff could read the resolution and then say that normal means is China to avoid any disads.
2. Aff burden- they have to defend all the plan since they chose to wrote it the way they did. If they messed up in this regard, they should lose.
3. Stops abusive clarification- if we don't stick the aff with their normal means, then they could easily shift in and out throughout the round, making them a moving target and killing all of our ground.
4. Predictable- it's called normal means because its normal. You should be able to defend it.
5. Ground- normal means counterplans are key to generic negative strategies. These are good when the status quo is indefensible and they make sure we don't have to do tons of case specific research.
6. At most you should reject the argument, not the team.
7. Err neg on theory- they get the first and last speech to frame the round, infinite prep time to get ready for every argument we have, and they already win most of the debates.

Consult Counterplans Bad

1. Not predictable-
 - a. There are an infinite number of entities that could be consulted. They could consult
 - b. There are an infinite number of potential issues that would lead to modification or even the rejection of plan.
2. Multiple worlds- the outcome of consultation is inherently conditional because the text does not specify if the consulted party says yes or no, or changes the plan. This skews 2AC time because the aff is forced to make answers against all the outcomes.
3. The counterplan does not have a solvency advocate. That's a voter for fairness because there is no literature on it. That means that we could not have predicted it and it would be impossible to find evidence to permute or straight turn it with.
4. It's not textually competitive. Textual competition is the most objective way to evaluate competition and checks artificial net benefits.
5. Plan encompassing counterplans are bad:
 - a. Their counterplan does 100% of the case and encompasses aspects of our advocacy, nullifying all 8 minutes of the 1AC and all of our offense from that speech. This is an independent voter for fairness and ground.
 - b. Counterplans that include part of the plan are justified, as they leave ground for the aff to debate. Plan encompassing counterplans, however, take the entire 1AC away from us.
6. The counterplan uses future fiat- it takes the initial action of consultation before implementation even begins. The aff plan is passed immediately while the neg counterplan takes time to occur, killing all unique disad ground to the counterplan. This justifies timeframe perms and delay counterplans.

1. Consult mechanism checks- all the aff needs to debate is consult good or bad, not the specific partner.
2. Increase education- we learn more about the consultation process and whomever we consult.
3. Counter-interpretation: Consult counterplans must argue that the (one country)/(one group of countries) they consult would say yes. This is best because: we open up an entirely new avenue for offense against the counterplan. The aff can either make the argument that the counterplan does not solve or kick our of their plan.
4. Aff Ground- the disad links to the plan, so we're giving their impact turns uniqueness and we could run the disad anyway and they can just answer it- we can't win without a net-benefit.
5. Counterplan ground- we need to be able to run consultation counterplans for times when the status quo is indefensible. We do not have time to research a counterplan for every possible case.
6. Predictable- there is no evidence for a net benefit to consulting Mexico. We couldn't find cards that say they would say yes if nothing else.
7. Not uniquely multiple worlds- we can either advocate the plan or not. There is no hidden conditionality because we can't concede arguments you do not make. Besides, conditionality is fine:

<Insert Conditionality Good Block>
8. No double fiat- we implement a consultation and act on the result. The result is part of the consultation and normal means. If not, then your funding allocation is double fiat.
9. Err neg- the aff has the first and last speech, infinite prep time, and wins the most debates.
10. Reject the argument, not the team... but only if they prove in round abuse.

Agent Counterplans Bad

1. Infinitely regressive- they can choose any agent to defend, from the Surgeon General to the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, which is horribly unpredictable, destroying any hope for clash.
2. Ground- they steal 8 minutes of 1AC offense because they do the same thing as the plan with a different agent. The counterplan is aff ground.
3. Education- they can run this counterplan on any topic, which means we lose topic and plan-specific education and instead just discuss things we already learn in government class.
4. Fiat assumes your counterplan- since normal means is the path of least resistance, fiat of the plan would be the counterplan if they win that their actor is superior, so either way you vote aff.

Agent Counterplans Good

1. Education- we learn more about the inter-workings of our government and the constitution and how different branches affect the outcomes of different policies.
2. Predictable- the counterplan is germane and they should have seen it coming. They chose their agent when they wrote their plan, they should have to defend it.
3. Counter-interpretation- the neg can only choose to defend one or more of the three branches of government; executive, legislative, or judicial. This solves their predictability arguments and provides for the most valuable education.
4. Err neg on theory- they get infinite prep time, speak first and last, and win the most debates. Since we can't predict every aff, agent counterplans are key negative ground needed to check back this advantage.
5. Don't vote against us without specific, in round abuse. At worst you should reject the argument, not the team.

Delay Counterplans Bad

1. Infinitely regressive- We can't possibly predict every possible delay or reason for that delay. Delay counterplans also justify any other type of counterplan that changes how plans are implemented.
2. They have plenty of counterplan ground- they can still run agent counterplans, PICs, etc.
3. Steals aff ground- they moot 8 minutes of our 1AC be doing our plan. We lose all of our offense and any add-on advantages. The counterplan doesn't test any part of the plan.
4. The counterplan is the plan- we pass our plan through normal means. Congressional legislation assumes multiple levels of bill creation, alteration, and implementation; resulting in an undetermined delay period built into any plan.
5. Reciprocity- we are stuck defending immediate implementation, they should be too.
6. No literature base- all uniqueness and evidence researched is done in the status quo, no authors write about a policy action and its consequences should it happen a set number of months from now.

Delay Counterplans Good

1. Education- we learn more about how the timing of plans change their outcome. Learning about the effects of the ever-changing political environment is extremely valuable and only possible within the policy debate laboratory.
2. Net Benefit checks abuse- all they have to do is take out the net-benefit and they'll be fine. They should have at least been prepared to answer that.
3. Ground- this should be dependable neg ground. They chose to write their plan as they did, so they should be able to defend all of it. That's their burden, and they have infinite prep time to be ready.
4. Real World- policy makers always evaluate the current and potential future political environment when deciding when to implement policies, like with Social Security reform.
5. Err neg on theory- they get infinite prep time, speak first and last, and win most debates.
6. Don't vote without specific, in round abuse. Let potential abuse be decided in potential, future debates.
7. At worst you should reject the argument, not the team.

Counterplan Solvency Advocate Necessary

The counterplan doesn't have an advocate for their specific plan text, this is a voting issue for competitive equity because:

1. Not predictable- there is no way we could have predicted it or be remotely prepared to debate it. That also means that no evidence exists to permute or turn the counterplan, which jacks our ground.
2. There is no literature- there are no specific cards so there is no in-depth debate. That's a voter for education.
3. It makes the counterplan automatically conditional- since all we can do is permute it. That's bad and a voting issue for fairness because:
 - a. Skews 2AC strat and the 1AR- there's no way of allowing the 2AC to make consistent offensive arguments against multiple worlds or the 1AR to answer it.
 - b. Justifies contradictions- conditionality allows us to make arguments that screw us on other flows like running a fear kritik and nuclear war disad.

Counterplan Solvency Advocate Not Necessary

1. No ground loss- you get ground off the net benefit. We make all of your impact turns unique.
2. They don't have a solvency advocate, so all the reasons why they can't find evidence on the counterplan apply to the 1AC and prove we have to run generic counterplans.
3. Solvency advocates are bad:
 - a. Kills intellectual creativity- All good thinking involves taking different ideas and putting them together in your own unique way. This is what you do every time you write a paper in college. They reduce debate to a series of book reports, crushing intellectual progress.
 - b. More Specific- having a solvency advocate allows us to morph the counterplan to match their solvency.
 - c. Fairness- there are no solvency advocates to generic counterplans. Generic counterplan ground is best because specific affs are inherently unpredictable, poor schools cannot afford to pay someone to prep them out, and most of the time the status quo is indefensible.
 - d. Education- we get to learn about issues that link to your proposed action, even if it isn't specific to your plan.
 - e. Reciprocal- the aff only gets to advocate things in the resolution and we only get to advocate counterplans that compete with the plan.
4. Reject the argument, not the team... and only if they prove specific in-round abuse.
5. Err neg on theory- the aff has the first and last speech, infinite prep time, and wins the most debates.

Textual Competition Bad

1. Infinitely regressive- anything can be textually competitive; all you have to do is change or add letters, numbers, or punctuation and it will be competitive. This destroys predictability and in-depth debate, skewing neg ground.
2. Destroys education- instead of debating about actual policy implementation, we're stuck with bad grammar and acronym debates, stuff we learn in English class.
3. Promotes vague plan writing- affs could write vague plan texts to spike out of counterplans. This destroys disad links, solvency debates, and encourages 2AC clarifications.
4. The research burden works both ways- in order to run a counterplan, we have to find literature on it.
5. Strategy skew- we can't read add-on advantages, which are critical for defense against the status quo, or case turns to the counterplans, because it's our plan action. Also means we lost 8 minutes of 1AC offense.
6. Functional competition is good:
 - a. Real world - policy makers care about the substantive benefits of bills and policies, not the exact text and grammar.
 - b. Destroys neg ground- the aff could simply perm a "not" out of the counterplan and completely shift their advocacy, avoiding the neg strategy.
 - c. Best policy option- functional competition allows the search for the best policy option by allowing a true comparison of net benefits.

Textual Competition Good

1. Textual competition provides the best brightline to test counterplans, which guarantees objectivity and fair evaluations of competition.
2. Predictability- we can't predict every tiny modification that could theoretically be made to our aff. There is nothing to restrain the negative's counterplans.
3. Key to limiting out bad PICs- which is good for aff ground.
4. Improves plan focus- forces a succinct debate over what the plan says and does, improving ground and education.
5. Real world- bills are rejected in congress because of grammatical errors.
6. They allow any plan minus type of counterplan, like plan minus one penny, leading to bad debate and gutting ground.
7. Prevents vague plan writing- since everything is explicitly listed in the plan. This is good because its predicable, preserves neg link ground, and prevents abusive 2AC morphing.

Severance Permutations Bad

1. Makes the aff a moving target- they can sever out of any disad or kritik link that we come up with. No counterplan could ever compete. This kills all negative ground and makes debate impossible.
2. Infinitely Regressive- there's no finite amount of changes they could make to their plan to avoid clash, which destroys stable advocacy and explodes negative research burdens.
3. Makes Them Non-Topical- it violates the word "resolved" which means "firm" because the aff is not firm in the 1AC advocacy. This is an independent voter for jurisdiction.
4. Destroys advocacy- debate teaches real world advocacy skills. The severance proves they are disingenuous.
5. Err neg- the aff has the first and last speech, infinite prep time, and wins the most debates.

Severance Permutations Good

1. Most Real World- laws are often modified if it is most beneficial.
2. Best Policy Option- the aff should be allowed to test the counterplan or kritik alternative on any level possible in order to debate the best issues, which increases education.
3. Conditionality of the 1NC justifies any severance.
4. Doesn't hurt neg ground- the perm is a test of competition, not a new advocacy- they still have the ability to weigh the net benefits against the perm and plan.
5. Increases strategic thinking- severance forces both teams to think quicker and more strategically to enhance the debate.
6. Its not a voting issue- if they win their arguments, we should just lose perm. They also get the neg block, kritiks, PICs, and 2NR strategy, so reject the perm, not the team.
7. Key to check a totalizing rejection of all plan action because of a tiny kritik link.
8. Focuses the debate on germane issues- plan focus leads to minor change arguments and detracts from the major issues, which are key to education.
9. Its reciprocal- counterplans serve to alter the baseline neg advocacy. We should be able to amend the plan the same way.
10. Proves the plan is a good idea- the portion of the plan in the permutation is justified, which means there's still a warrant to vote aff.
11. Topicality checks abuse- the aff should be allowed to alter the plan as much as they want in the 2AC as long as it's still topical. If it's topical, the neg should be prepared to debate it- they have the block.

Intrinsic Permutations Bad

1. Makes the affirmative conditional and a moving target- there are an infinite number of additions that can be made to the plan which aren't predictable or debatable. Vote on the cumulative harm.
2. It's extra-topical and an independent voting issue- their perm proves the resolution is not sufficient by itself which disproves the resolution, and intrinsicness justifies 5 minute plans in the 1AC that spike out of all negative arguments.
3. Skews negative ground- allows the aff to spike out of neg disads or counterplans by adding things to the plan.
4. Kills education- Intrinsicness trumps any type of policy comparison, which is critical to debate and being able to use debate in other situations.
5. No counterplan could compete because such perms could eliminate the possibilities for any net benefits.
6. Voting issue for competitive equity and ground for the reasons above.
7. Err neg on theory- the aff has the first and last speech, infinite prep time, and wins the most debates.

Intrinsic Permutations Good

1. Increases education- we will learn about more versions of the plan and how those interact, increasing their strategic thinking as well.
2. Proves the plan is a good idea- the whole plan is still included in the perm, which proves the plan is justified. Adding something else is an enabling mechanism which proves the counterplan doesn't really compete.
3. Better Policy Making- allows the aff to create the best possible policy option.
4. No advocacy shift- we still advocate the same thing we did in the 1AC. The intrinsicness part of the perm is simply an extension and clarification of our original plan, so they still get their case-specific link ground.
5. Intrinsicness forces the debate onto the core of the topic instead of irrelevant tangents or lame process arguments that are horrible for education.
6. Its reciprocal- intrinsic perms test the germaness of the net benefit to the plan, just like the counterplan tests the link from the plan to the advantage.
7. Topicality checks abuse- The aff should be allowed to alter the plan as much as they want in the 2AC as long as its still topical. If its topical, the neg should be prepared to debate it, and they have the block to answer it.
8. At worst you should reject the argument, not the team. Our whole plan is still justified unless they prove specific, in round abuse.

Timeframe Permutations Bad

1. Destroys any check on competition- the aff can do opposite actions at different times, like increasing and decreasing foreign aid.
2. Infinitely regressive- the aff could always delay implementation of the plan and destroy neg ground.
3. Destroys negative disad uniqueness- justifies the aff waiting until the disad is non-unique to pass the plan.
4. Its severance and intrinsic- its non-operational for its original timeframe and it adds temporal sequencing- makes them a moving target and kills neg ground.
5. They make solvency probabilistic- we don't know when or if the plan is actually passed.
6. Voting issue for competitive equity and ground for the reasons above.
7. Err neg on theory- the aff has the first and last speech, infinite prep time, and wins the most debates.

Timeframe Permutations Good

1. No moving target- the entire plan is still advocated as a good idea. The perm simply proves that the plan is not a good idea at a given time. The resolution does not specify when the USFG should act.
2. Key to aff ground- timeframe perms are the only way to check delay counterplans, which is the worst argument in debate because they can make any disad automatically outweigh the case, and make the 1AC irrelevant.
3. Most Real World- policymakers must be careful about choosing when to implement policies.
4. Not severance- the world immediately is not in our plan, they can't point to a single word in the plan that the perm severs. Perms that include the whole plan are not abusive, it just proves the counterplan doesn't compete.
5. Don't vote on potential abuse, future rounds check.
6. At most you should reject the perm, not the team.

Multiple Permutations Bad

1. Makes the aff conditional- they can go for any, all, or none of the infinite number of perms they can come up with. Aff conditionality is uniquely abusive because a stable aff advocacy is critical to neg positions and testing whether the plan is a good idea.
2. Not Reciprocal- the neg only gets one advocacy for an infinite number of perms, which destroys competitive equity.
3. No straight-turn check- we can't stick them with the perm with a straight turn.
4. Multiple worlds- we are stuck debating multiple worlds, which skews time allocation and decreases the depth of the debate, which crushes education.
5. Time skew- it takes them literally 3 seconds to make a perm and we have to spend 30 seconds answering each one.
6. Hurts education- the more advocacies floating around in the debate, the less depth we have on each policy issue.
7. Err neg on theory- the aff has the first and last speech, infinite prep time, and wins the most debates.

Multiple Permutations Good

1. Key to checking competition on multiple levels- it's not a moving target because you just have to prove competition.
2. Increases critical and innovative thinking skills.
3. Reciprocity- the counterplan has multiple parts- multiple perms are key to testing those parts.
4. Critical to perm ground against vague kritiks or counterplans. We need to be able to cover our bases.
5. The perm is a test- its not advocated:
 - a. Its like a no link argument- a test to see if the counterplan is germane whereas the counterplan can be advocated.
 - b. The perm is a combination- its just the plan and the counterplan or some combination of the two which doesn't create new worlds.
6. The neg block checks abuse- they get 13 minutes to our 5 minute 1AR.
7. Doesn't justify conditionality-
 - a. The perm is not an advocacy platform.
 - b. Only checks the link so there's no way we can dodge out of your arguments.
8. Increases your link ground while allowing a check of competition.
9. Critical to check back plan inclusive kritiks, ensures our ground is preserved.
10. No abuse- just prove there's no net benefit to the perms and you'll be fine. Don't vote on potential abuse, future rounds check.
11. At most you should reject the perms, not the team.

Aff Framework vs. Kritiks

Fiat is good:

1. Key to learning about the resolution, the government, and policymaking.
2. Predictability- their framework justifies any unpredictable criticism that we can't expect by looking at the resolution.
3. Most educational- in our framework we learn about the current political environment and constantly research current events. In their framework a team can cut one book at the beginning of the year, hurting topic-specific education.
4. Plan focus- talking about bare life or "traversing the fantasy" doesn't tell me what happens to plan.
5. Judge intervention- in their framework judges are unable to make clean calls when they have to inject their personal opinions into the debate.
6. They can't win offense- our framework allows for kritiks but they must have links based off of the plan and a textual policy alternative- this is key to us accessing viable perms.
7. Aff choice is key to fairness and ground, we lose 8 minutes of 1AC offense and only get three speeches to their four.
8. **The competitive nature of debate prevents any moral or aesthetic registers.**

Mitchell, 1998

(Gordon, Assistant Professor of Communication at the University of Pittsburgh, "Pedagogical possibilities for argumentative agency in academic debate", online)

While an isolated academic space that affords students an opportunity to learn in a protected environment has significant pedagogical value (see e.g. Coverstone 1995, p. 8-9), the notion of the academic debate tournament as a sterile laboratory carries with it some disturbing implications, when the metaphor is extended to its limit. To the extent that the academic space begins to take on characteristics of a laboratory, the barriers demarcating such a space from other spheres of deliberation beyond the school grow taller and less permeable. When such barriers reach insurmountable dimensions, argumentation in the academic setting unfolds on a purely simulated plane, with students practicing critical thinking and advocacy skills in strictly hypothetical thought-spaces. Although they may research and track public argument as it unfolds outside the confines of the laboratory for research purposes, in this approach, students witness argumentation beyond the walls of the academy as spectators, with little or no apparent recourse to directly participate or alter the course of events (see Mitchell 1995; 1998). The sense of (Mitchell continues...)

Aff Framework vs. Kritiks

(Mitchell continues...)

detachment associated with the spectator posture is highlighted during episodes of alienation in which debaters cheer news of human suffering or misfortune. Instead of focusing on the visceral negative responses to news accounts of human death and misery, debaters overcome with the competitive zeal of contest round competition show a tendency to concentrate on the meanings that such evidence might hold for the strength of their academic debate arguments. For example, news reports of mass starvation might tidy up the "uniqueness of a disadvantage" or bolster the "inherency of an affirmative case" (in the technical parlance of debate-speak). Murchland categorizes cultivation of this "spectator" mentality as one of the most politically debilitating failures of contemporary education: "Educational institutions have failed even more grievously to provide the kind of civic forums we need. In fact, one could easily conclude that the principle purposes of our schools is to deprive successor generations of their civic voice, to turn them into mute and uncomprehending spectators in the drama of political life" (1991, p. 8).

Neg Kritik Framework

1. Our kritik is predictable.
 - a. It's germane and run on various topics, they should have heard it before.
 - b. It attacks a basic assumption of their affirmative that they should be defending.
 - c. Disads are way more unpredictable.
2. Critical arguments are key to excellent policymaking- every policy must be ethically sound; otherwise they will produce unintended and harmful consequences.
3. No time skew- we only read a few arguments and are still going for they kritik right now.
4. Aff choice is bad- aff choice is arbitrary and justifies any framework. They didn't waste 8 minutes in the 1AC if they just meet your burden and defend the discourse and assumptions of the 1AC. They should be prepared to do that, don't blame us if they're not.
5. Judge intervention is inevitable. The large number of 2-1 decisions on panels is proof.
6. They eliminate an entire body of important literature and thought just because they think it's more predictable. If we win that critical thinking is good, especially regarding the warrants of our kritik, then you should reject that blind exclusion.
7. They still have ground- they can read critical advantages and defend their assumptions.
8. Demand for the "best policy option" justifies multiple conditional counterplans. This is way worse for the aff in terms of ground and time management.
9. Evaluating representations is a good:
 - a. Key to check gendered or racist language that would go unchallenged under their framework.
 - b. Key to maintaining author credibility, which is vital for fairness.
10. They can access all of their impacts if they can simply justify the discourse and assumptions of the 1AC.
11. Role playing is bad- Role playing creates a loss of personal agency. We can only work within our social location to create real change in the world. They force us to become assimilated within the system that we speak out against. We are not, and probably will not be, real policy makers, so we shouldn't pretend to be. We can still learn about policymaking in our framework.

Neg Kritik Framework

12. Err neg on theory- they get infinite prep, speak first and last, and win most debates. They must prove specific, in-round abuse. Let potential abuse be decided in potential rounds.

13. We give a better account of politics. Sealing off inquiry with framework guarantees serial policy failure, and basing decisions on predictions ensures the abusive use of biopower.

Dillon and Reid, 2000

(Michael Dillon- professor of politics at the University of Lancaster and Julian Reid- department of politics at the University of Lancaster, *Alternatives*, "Global Governance, Liberal Peace, and Complex Emergency", Volume 25)

As a precursor to global governance, governmentality, according to Foucault's initial account, poses the question of order not in terms of the origin of the law and the location of sovereignty, as do traditional accounts of power, but in terms instead of the management of population. The management of population is further refined in terms of specific problematics to which population management may be reduced. These typically include but are not necessarily exhausted by the following topoi of governmental power: economy, health, welfare, poverty, security, sexuality, demographics, resources, skills, culture, and so on. Now, where there is an operation of power there is knowledge, and where there is knowledge there is an operation of power. Here discursive formations emerge and, as Foucault noted, in every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organised and redistributed by a certain number of procedures whose role is to ward off its powers and dangers, to gain mastery over its chance events, to evade its ponderous, formidable materiality.[34]

More specifically, where there is a policy problematic there is expertise, and where there is expertise there, too, a policy problematic will emerge. Such problematics are detailed and elaborated in terms of discrete forms of knowledge as well as interlocking policy domains. Policy domains reify the problematization of life in certain ways by turning these epistemically and politically contestable orderings of life into "problems" that require the continuous attention of policy science and the continuous resolutions of policymakers. Policy "actors" develop and compete on the basis of the expertise that grows up around such problems or clusters of problems and their client populations. Here, too, we may also discover what might be called "epistemic entrepreneurs." Albeit the market for discourse is prescribed and policed in ways that Foucault indicated, bidding to formulate novel problematizations they seek to "sell" these, or otherwise have them officially adopted. In principle, there is no limit to the ways in which the management of population may be problematized. All aspects of human conduct, any encounter with life, is problematizable. Any problematization is capable of becoming a policy problem. Governmentality thereby creates a market for policy, for science and for policy science, in which problematizations go looking for policy sponsors while policy sponsors fiercely compete on behalf of their favored problematizations.

Reproblematization of problems is constrained by the institutional and ideological investments surrounding accepted "problems," and by the sheer difficulty of challenging the inescapable ontological and epistemological assumptions that go into their very formation. There is nothing so fiercely contested as an epistemological or ontological assumption. And there is nothing so fiercely ridiculed as the suggestion that the real problem with problematizations exists precisely at the level of such assumptions. Such "paralysis of analysis" is precisely what policymakers seek to avoid since they are compelled constantly to respond to circumstances over which they ordinarily have in fact both more and less control than they proclaim. What they do not have is precisely the control that they want. Yet serial policy failure--the fate and the fuel of all policy--compels them into a continuous search for the new analysis that will extract them from the aporias in which they constantly find themselves enmeshed.[35]

Serial policy failure is no simple shortcoming that science and policy--and policy science--will ultimately

(Dillon and Reid continue...)

Neg Kritik Framework

(Dillon and Reid continue...)

overcome. Serial policy failure is rooted in the ontological and epistemological assumptions that fashion the ways in which global governance encounters and problematizes life as a process of emergence through fitness landscapes that constantly adaptive and changing ensembles have continuously to negotiate. As a particular kind of intervention into life, global governance promotes the very changes and unintended outcomes that it then serially reproblematises in terms of policy failure. Thus, global liberal governance is not a linear problem-solving process committed to the resolution of objective policy problems simply by bringing better information and knowledge to bear upon them. A nonlinear economy of power/knowledge, it deliberately installs socially specific and radically inequitable distributions of wealth, opportunity, and mortal danger both locally and globally through the very detailed ways in which life is variously (policy) problematized by it. In consequence, thinking and acting politically is displaced by the institutional and epistemic rivalries that infuse its power/ knowledge networks, and by the local conditions of application that govern the introduction of their policies. These now threaten to exhaust what "politics," locally as well as globally, is about.[36] It is here that the "emergence" characteristic of governance begins to make its appearance. For it is increasingly recognized that there are no definitive policy solutions to objective, neat, discrete policy problems. The "subjects" of policy increasingly also become a matter of definition as well, since the concept population does not have a stable referent either and has itself also evolved in biophilosophical and biomolecular as well as Foucauldian "biopower" ways.

14. Language is all encompassing and the basis for domination.

Bleiker, 2000

(Roland, Coordinator of the Peace and Conflict Studies Program at the University of Queensland, "Popular Dissent, Human Agency, and Global Politics", pg. 215)

Language is one of the most fundamental aspects of human life. It is omnipresent. It penetreates every aspect of transversal politics, from the local to the global. We speak, Heidegger stresses, when we are awake and we are asleep, even when we do not utter a single word. We speak when we listen, read or silently pursue an occupation. We are always speaking because we cannot think without language, because 'language is the house of Being', the home within which we dwell. But languages are never neutral. They embody particular values and ideas. They are integral part of transversal power relations and of global politics in general. Languages impose sets of assumptions on us, frame our thoughts so subtly that we are mostly unaware of the systems of exclusive that are being entrenched through this process

Floating PICS Good

1. We're not stealing your plan. We solve something that causes your harms. There's no abuse.
2. The kritik is pretty germane. That means:
 - a. Its predictable- don't punish us because they didn't do enough research.
 - b. Its in the literature- so its ground we are entitled to. They should be ready for it.
3. PICS are good:
 - a. Education- we can test particular assumptions which allows for a comparative analysis of their advocacy relative to ours.
 - b. Ground- they chose to put together their aff like they did, so they should be prepared to defend the entirety of it, and we should be entitled to attack any parts of it, that's our ground.
 - c. Better debates- we can have more in-depth debates on specific, relevant issues, rather than repetitive, shallow ones.
4. Not a reason to vote against us:
 - a. A germane kritik discussion inevitably forces us to include some of their plan in our advocacy.
 - b. Key to argumentative development- a good kritik debate focuses on issues that may become clearer in the 2AC and therefore allows for a better description in the neg block, which allows for argumentative development and understanding the intricacies of issues.
5. There are multiple checks on abuse:
 - a. They put it in their plan, they should defend it.
 - b. Germane net benefits to the alternative check abuse.
 - c. Aff bias- they get infinite prep time, speak first and last, and win most debates.
 - d. Just turn the net benefit or prove that the alternative doesn't solve the case.
6. Without floating PICS we would lose all kritiks on the perm or be stuck defending the undesirable status quo.
7. Turn- textual focus justifies racist language and encourages plan vagueness because they aren't responsible for anything else.
8. Our alternative is stable and we will defend everything we say, so it's not floating.
9. Only vote on real, in-round abuse. Let potential abuse be decided in potential rounds.

Alternative Text Necessary

Kritik alternatives must have a stable text for the following reasons:

1. Stability- not having a text allows them to shift in round which destroys fairness and predictability. Our ground against the kritik is destroyed and it will be impossible for the 1AR to recover from the 13 minute block with new alternative analysis.
2. Reciprocity- the neg has the option to straight turn the aff advantage; the aff should have the same ability. We must have a plan text, so should they.
3. Permutation ground- we cannot perm the kritik if we don't know the exact nature of the alternative.
4. Provokes judge intervention- not having a text makes fair policy comparisons impossible. The judge must intervene to decide what exactly the neg is advocating, which is unfair to us.
5. Clarification does not check abuse- our 2AC time allocation and strategy has already been skewed, that's clear in round abuse.
6. This is a voter for competitive equity and education for the reasons above.

Alternative Text Not Necessary

1. Cross-examination checks abuse- they could have asked in cx what the text of the alternative was.
2. Perms are worse- they didn't read full texts, and saying two words like "do both" is just as bad.
3. The kritik functions as a solvency turn- our kritik exposes the fundamental flaws of the case and why as a result the aff's ability to solve for the harms they claim is suspect and/or exacerbated by the plan- we don't need alternatives for solvency turns.
4. Turn- they never read a text on the definition of fiat or their framework.
5. Our evidence functions as the alternative and the tag will be defended as the text, solves their moving target arguments and allows for in-depth debate and understanding of our position while increasing aff perm ground.
6. Reducing complex arguments to a text is nonsensical and harmful. Nobody asked Gandhi for his text.
7. Textual competition is bad:
 - a. Justifies severance and perm "do the alternative", killing our ground. That's a voting issue.
 - b. Nonsensical- our kritik not only criticizes the plan but their rhetorical claims as well. Focusing on texts alone lets them get away with 7 minutes of racist jokes.
 - c. Functionality is better than playing word scrabble because then we can learn about the consequences of ideas.
8. Perms are the ultimate check on abuse.
9. At worst you will reject the alternative, in which case we will still win that the aff plan is undesirable.
10. Demand for a text destroys kritiks- otherwise we would have just run a counterplan. We have to question the way we understand the world before we can prescribe solutions. Forcing specific alternatives destroys this critical, predictable neg ground.
11. Err neg on theory- they get infinite prep time, speak first and last, and win most debates.
12. Only vote on real, in round abuse. Let potential abuse be decided in potential future rounds.

Covert Plans Bad

1. Ground- we lose all disad ground because the plan isn't perceived by anyone. There is no evidence assuming covert action. We also lose counterplan ground because the counterplan is either perceived or too covert to solve. Clash is literally impossible.
2. Not real world- congress doesn't do things covertly if they have widespread implications. Legislators wouldn't try to hide their plan.
3. Abuse- any plan can be covert. They only make it covert to spike out of all of our links.
4. This is a voter for competitive equity and education for the reasons above.

Future Fiat Bad

1. Ground- all uniqueness and evidence researched is done in the status quo, no authors write about a policy action and its consequences should it happen a set number of months from now.
2. Predictability- if you can fiat a future action, then all research done for plans in the status quo, which is possibly the entire literature base, becomes obsolete. Debatability is destroyed.
3. Reciprocity- the aff is stuck with current action in the status quo, the neg should be too.
4. Solvency is probabilistic- we don't know when or if the plan actually occurs, or the conditions surrounding that future action.
5. Not topical and a voter for fairness and jurisdiction, because it:
 - a. Violates T: "Should"- since should implies 'now'.
 - b. Violates T: "Resolved"- because resolved means 'firm'.
6. Vote on presumption- demonstrates that the plan is not a good idea now, so defer to the status quo by voting neg.
7. Not real world- no policy maker makes a decision to make a decision a few months later.
8. Competitive equity- future fiat allows the unfair advantage of claiming the same idea yet a certain time from now in order to dodge a disad.
9. Err neg on theory- they get infinite prep time, get to speak first and last, and win most debates.
10. This is an independent voter for fairness, competitive equity, and education for all the reasons above.

Performative Contradictions Bad

1. Fairness- they can run a free trade good and bad disad and we would always lose because we can't generate an offense.
2. Ground- we can't argue against contradicting positions without double turning ourselves.
3. Clash- debate is about two teams clashing with each other, not themselves. They are ruining the basic educational value of the activity.
4. Argumentative responsibility- letting them make contradicting arguments makes us contradict ourselves. Make them stick to one consistent advocacy.
5. Negation Theory flawed- the neg gets to kick disads because of negation theory, not run contradicting positions.
6. Voter for competitive equity, education, and time skew for the reasons above.

Performative Contradictions Good

1. The positions don't contradict because _____.
2. The positions operate on different levels, we have the right to test the aff on both of those levels.
3. If they really contradicted then they could just concede one and get out of the other.
4. Negation theory checks- all we have to do is prove that the aff plan is a bad idea.
5. They still get the 2AR to answer the arguments we go for.
6. Time skews are inevitable- don't penalize us if they aren't fast or efficient enough to answer all of our arguments.
7. Err neg on this theory argument. They get infinite prep time, speak first and last, and win most debates.
8. Performative contradictions are good:
 - a. Increases strategic thinking- they have to make smart 2AC answers rather than relying on prewritten information. If the ultimate impact to their argument is education then you vote for us.
 - b. Increases education- we get to see two different sides of issues.
 - c. Increases ground- increases the number of arguments we can run and turns they can make, which can only increase education.
 - d. Increases clash- the aff now has more ground to clash with the neg since there's more argumentation occurring on multiple levels.
9. Don't vote without specific, in-round abuse. Let potential abuse be decided in potential, future rounds.
10. At worst you will reject the argument(s), not the team.

Framework vs. Critical Affirmatives

Their affirmative is bad for debate and education for a couple of reasons:

1. Predictability- non-literal interpretations of the topic make the resolution functionally meaningless. The resolution becomes porous and loses its ability to serve as a guide for neg research.
2. Kills neg ground- lack of plan makes it impossible to have competitive counterplans or test the merits of the particular outcome of the aff advocacy. Disadvantages to plan are based on the current political circumstances – allowing affs to change their time implementation destroys all relevant disadvantage ground.
3. Moving target- without a stable plan text the affirmative can dodge our 1nc by reinterpreting what their advocacy is, plan focus is essential for stable and fair division of ground.
4. Fairness- all the literature is skewed their direction—no one says that the civil rights movement was bad—or racism is good, affs interpretation forces the neg into indefensible ground.
5. Intervention – encourages judicial intervention since aesthetics are subjective; its all about the judge's reaction which is not debatable. Debates will be centered around theatrics rather than coherent policy change. Hierarchies will continue to exist with those who can act or dance the best. Their framework won't have a coherent way to evaluate the debate or weigh the argument interaction.
6. You must evaluate the 'plan' in a vacuum test – can you advocate their ideas without topical action? This proves the uniqueness to our education claims of hearing the same arguments every year.
7. The government isn't going to change because you win an affirmative. Proves your advocacy is a sham. Your evidence is non-existent on this question, and all the debate rounds that have been won and produced zero government change disprove the value of local advocacy, and the value of playing a game with rules.
8. If they can change mindsets our counter-advocacy is to have rapists stop raping and war mongers to stop causing war and human rights violators to stop violating rights.
9. Switch side debating solves- they can run these arguments when they debate neg, checks back all of their offense.